

Appln. No. 10/590,894
Amdt. dated December 15, 2008
Reply to Office Action of Sept. 15, 2008

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached drawing sheet includes the following changes:

The header has been removed from the top of the drawing sheet. Fig. 1 has not been amended.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
Annotated Drawing Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

The Official Action of September 15, 2008, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 10-12, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 1-9 have been cancelled and new claims 10-12 added. Claims 10-12 remain in the application for consideration.

In response to the Examiner's objection to the drawings and the specification, Applicant has enclosed herewith Fig. 1 which was inadvertently omitted at the time of filing the application and clearly corresponds to the single figure of International Application PCT/EP2004/008967 from which Applicant claims priority. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objections have now been overcome.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haid '841 in view of Kellner '050. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as applied to new claims 10-12.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching in either Haid or Kellner of the claimed plastic joint spacer (2), as neither provide for the claimed flat reference surface (22) and the short plastic knobs (24B) injected between the reference surface (22) and a side of the groove in the stone panel.

Further, neither of the cited patents provide for the softer and more flexible plastic having projections that are fixed against the corner chamfers of the stone panels.

Applicant submits that at least the structural differences identified above define the claimed invention over the cited prior art.

Appln. No. 10/590,894
Amdt. dated December 15, 2008
Reply to Office Action of Sept. 15, 2008

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\B\Back\Rinsche1\Pto\2008-12-15-Amendment.doc